

During the interview, Applicant's representatives and Examiner discussed the rejection of claim 1 in view of Takizawa (U S Patent No. 6,120,711). Applicant's representatives argue that the prior art Takizawa discloses pressure difference based on formulation of $Pd = \{(v.S)/(C.A)\}^2$, wherein the Pressure difference is not related to minimum charged pressure and maximum charged pressure. Therefore, the prior art Takizawa fails to teach or suggest or disclose a charge pressure setting process means which sets the upper limit of the charge pressure on the basis of the pressure difference between the minimum sensed charged pressure of the charged pressure which is sensed and the maximum sensed drive pressure of the drive pressure which is sensed. Applicant's representative arguments are fully considered and found persuasive. Applicant is advised to submit the amendment to the claims with the remark for the previous office action mailed on 12/10/2007.

/D. N. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Philip C Tucker/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791